

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/097,243

Applicant(s)

Manne

Examiner

Rodney Fuller

Group Art Unit

2851

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney Fuller

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Donald Lucas

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 22, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11

Identification of prior art discussed:

Martin (US 5,610,674)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant made the argument that claim 11 of the present invention is distinguished over Martin in that the present invention utilizes a "mixing bed" to combine the scents before being sent to the users nose, while Martin uses individual tubes to provide individual scents to the users nose. The examiner agrees that claim 11 appears to be patentable over Martin. The applicant intends to cancel claim 1 and associated dependent claims or amend the dependent claims to depend from claim 11. The examiner indicated that claim 11 could be arguable rejected over Manne (US 5,949,522) with an obvious double patenting rejection. The applicant will consider submitting a terminal disclaimer to accelerate prosecution. Greenwood (US 4,744,356) and Ward (US 5,906,298) are made of record as being related art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04) If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. Attachments on reverse side or on attached sheet

Examiner's Note: This is a copy of the interview summary.  
Attachment to a signed office action